

REMARKS

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following remarks and reconsideration of the subject application. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments herein. The remarks and amendments should be entered under 37 CFR. § 1.116 as they place the application in better form for appeal, or for resolution on the merits.

[0004] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1, 5, 7-11, 13, 14, 17-21, 23-26, 28, 32-36, 38-41, 43-47 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1, 17, and 32. Claims withdrawn or cancelled herein are 4, 6, 22, and 37. No new claims are added herein.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0005] The Examiner graciously talked with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on March 13, 2009. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0006] During the interview, I discussed how the claims differed from the cited references, namely Bent, Ebbo, and Melhem. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed several possible clarifying amendments.

[0007] The Examiner was receptive to the proposals. However, the Examiner indicated that he would need to review the cited art more carefully and/or do another search, and requested that the proposed amendments be presented in writing.

[0008] Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited references of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0009] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can discuss this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0010] Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments

[0011] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 17, and 32 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are

made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references.

[0012] Support for the amendments to claims 1, 17, and 32 is found in the specification at least in paragraphs 17 and 31.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 103

[0013] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 4-11, 13, 14, 17-26, 28, 32-41, 43-47 under § 103. In response, Applicant has amended the claims to overcome the Examiner's rejections.

[0014] Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0015] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following references alone or in combination:

- **Bent:** *Bent, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,463,442 (issued October 8, 2002);
- **Ebbo:** *Ebbo, et al.*, US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0025728 (Published February 6, 2003); and
- **Melhem:** *Melhem, et al.*, US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0078760 (Published April 22, 2004).

Overview of the Application

[0016] The Application describes a technology for a data item that has a data item property with an associated value and a user interface element that has an element property with a value that can be defined by an association to the data item property. A binding definition associates the element property of the user interface element with the data item property such that an application program which generates a user interface for display can be developed

independent of the data item, and such that the data item can be developed independent of display-related information corresponding to the user interface element.

Cited References

[0017] The Examiner cites Bent as the primary reference in the obviousness-based rejections. The Examiner cites Ebbo and Melhem as secondary references in the obviousness-based rejections.

Bent

[0018] Bent describes a technology for a container independent data binding system that independently facilitates data binding by way of a binding agent object on behalf of any data consumer and/or data source that conforms to the necessary interfaces and protocols. The binding agent facilitates data binding and transparent data access for any visual and/or non-visual object, in addition to control data verification for client-side control validation independent of a container, binding collection for non-data aware objects that can benefit from data binding, data conversion and formatting to control User Interface displays in the context of data binding, and repeater control to facilitate a list view for visual objects, for any object that requires and requests access to these features rather than individually implementing these features without binding agent support.

Ebbo

[0019] Ebbo describes a technology for creating an intermediate language or source code file from a server-side resource or dynamic web page file using a hierarchically specified set of user controls. The source code can then be compiled into an executable class allowing for rapid generation of web page control objects that perform server-side functions, including the rendering of client responses. The code generation scheme of the present invention is capable of creating control objects connected in a hierarchy to handle event processing and the setting of attributes to the specific objects.

Melhem

[0020] Melhem describes an XSLT-based transformation process that addresses the performance problems of ordinary XSLT transformations and provides for an efficient conversion of many sources of raw, or interpreted, application data into many different interpretations. In addition, the data may be filtered to downstream users, thus enabling the use of security measures by way of the filters.

Obviousness Rejections

Based upon Bent, Ebbo, and Melhem

[0021] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 4-11, 13, 14, 17-26, 28, 32-41, 43-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bent, Ebbo, and Melhem. In response, Applicant has amended the claims to overcome the Examiner's rejections.

Independent Claim 1

[0022] Applicant submits that combined references do not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- "a data style definition configured to define a visual representation of the data item on a user interface, ***wherein the associated values of the data item properties influence the appearance of a plurality of features of the user interface element***, wherein the data items are maintained independently from the data style definition, and wherein ***the data item is represented on a display as a visual subtree of the user interface element*** and the data item properties are represented as part of the visual subtree"
- "a binding definition configured to associate the element property of the user interface element with the data item property, ***wherein the binding definition facilitates one-time binding wherein a user interface property is initialized from a data item property and***

wherein the user interface property does not update when changes are made to the data item property after the initialization'

[0023] Rather, the portions of Bent cited by the Examiner (col. 16, lines 3-24) simply teach that a format object is capable of changing ***the type*** of the data stored in a data source (e.g., from a string to a variant). It is the format object then, that influences "the appearance of a plurality of features of the user interface element", not the values of the data item properties, which are converted by the format object. In fact, by converting the type of the data item values, Bent arguable prevents data item properties – which might otherwise influence appearance – from influencing that appearance. For example, a data item property may in fact be a "type" of the data item, such as string. By converting the type, the format object of Bent prevents that data item property from influencing the "appearance of a plurality of features of the user interface element", as claimed by claim 1.

[0024] Further, the portions of Ebbo cited by the Examiner as disclosing that "the data item is represented ... as a ... subtree of the user interface element and the data item properties are represented as part of the ... subtree" – paragraphs 46 and 47, simply describe a hierarchy of user interface elements. No mention is made of including the data items represented by the user interface element as a subtree, nor is any motivation for doing so disclosed. Further, Applicant has amended this recitation to say that the data item is represented *on a display* as a *visual* subtree of a user interface element, thus manifesting to a user, such as a programmer, the relationship between the user interface element

and the data item. Nothing in Ebbo paragraphs 46 and 47 discusses visual trees or subtrees, much less a visual subtree of a user interface element for a data item.

[0025] Lastly, nothing in the cited references discloses “wherein the binding definition facilitates one-time binding wherein a user interface property is initialized from a data item property and wherein the user interface property does not update when changes are made to the data item property after the initialization.” In rejecting similar recitations of claim 4, the Examiner pointed to components of Bent including a “removeDataSourceListener” method for removing a data consumer from a notification list. Nothing in Bent, however, teaches that a *binding definition* facilitates one-time binding.

[0026] As shown above, the combined references do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Independent Claims 17 and 32

[0027] These claims include recitations similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons given above, claims 17 and 32 are patentable over the cited references.

Dependent Claims 4-11, 13, 14, 18-26, 28, 33-41, 43-47

[0028] Claims 4, 6, 22, and 37 are cancelled herein, thereby obviating their rejections.

[0029] Claims 5, 7-11, 13, 14, 18-21, 23-26, 28, 33-36, 38-41, and 43-47 ultimately depend upon independent claims 1, 17, and 32. As discussed above, claims 1, 17, and 32 are allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Conclusion

[0030] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

/Robert C. Peck/

Dated: March 23, 2009

Robert L. Villhard (bob@leehayes.com; x5005)

Registration No. 53725

Robert C. Peck (robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)

Registration No. 56826

Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (509) 324-9256

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

www.leehayes.com